

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 and 20-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 9-11 and 14-18 are amended and new claims 21-25 are added. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action objects to the disclosure and claims 1, 6, 10, 14 and 18 because of informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments to the specification and claims obviate the grounds for objections. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

The Office Action appears to reject claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted the above amendment to claim 17 obviates the grounds for rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over JP 11-136355 to Yoshikawa. However, the Office Action then discusses corresponding U.S. Patent 6,298,372. In view of this, applicant will refer to U.S. Patent 6,298,372 to Yoshikawa. The Office Action also rejects claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yoshikawa and U.S. Patent 6,377,570 to Vaziri et al. (hereafter Vaziri). Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 3, 4, 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yoshikawa in combination with Vaziri, U.S. Patent 6,028,848 to Bhatia et al. (hereafter Bhatia), U.S. Patent 6,873,689 to Butler et al. (hereafter Butler) and U.S. Patent 6,246,678 to Yamamoto. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites an integrated services digital network (ISDN) phone unit including a first connector to connect to an ISDN, an IP phone unit including a second

connector to connect to the Internet or a computer, the ISDN phone unit being different than the IP phone unit. Independent claim 1 also recites a control unit which recognizes an ISDN mode, an IP mode and an external connection mode by analyzing input data and the control unit controls a voice signal path between the ISDN phone unit and the IP phone unit based on the recognized mode.

Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, Yoshikawa does not relate to an ISDN phone unit being different than an IP phone unit as recited in independent claim 1. Rather, Yoshikawa merely relates to a computer apparatus 2 that is coupled to an ISDN line 3. The computer apparatus 2 includes an ISDN interface unit 26. A switch 28 switches between terminal a and terminal b depending on a normal ISDN telephone use or an internet telephone use. See col. 7, lines 45-50.

Yoshikawa does not relate to a dual phone that includes an ISDN phone unit and an IP phone unit in which the ISDN phone unit is different than the IP phone unit. Rather, in Yoshikawa, all communications are provided along a single ISDN line 3 to a public line network 4. Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest an ISDN phone unit including a first connector to connect to an ISDN and the IP phone unit including a second connector to connect to the internet or a computer. Even more specifically, Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest the claimed first and second connectors. For at least these reasons, Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 14 relates to a method of telecommunication using a dual phone in which an integrated services digital network (ISDN) phone unit and an IP phone unit are included in a single device, the ISDN phone unit including a first interface with an ISDN, the IP phone unit being separate from the ISDN phone unit and including a second interface with the Internet or a computer. Independent claim 14 also recites connecting a data and a voice signal path between the ISDN phone unit and the IP phone unit. The Office Action cites Yoshikawa's col. 8, lines 3-26 for these features. However, Yoshikawa does not relate to a connection between an ISDN phone unit and an IP phone unit in which the IP phone unit is separate from the ISDN phone unit. Accordingly, Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 14. Vaziri does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 14 missing from Yoshikawa. Accordingly, Yoshikawa and Vaziri do not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 14. Independent claim 14 therefore defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 17 recites a method for processing calls in the phone unit that includes an ISDN phone unit and an Internet phone unit, the ISDN phone unit including a first interface with an ISDN and the IP phone unit being separate from the ISDN phone unit and including a second interface with the Internet or a computer. Furthermore, independent claim 17 recites receiving a signal selecting a mode of operation of the phone, and automatically establishing a voice path between the Internet phone unit and the ISDN phone unit in said selected mode when a user enters an external connection request with a called party.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 17. Furthermore, Yoshikawa does not receive a signal selecting a mode of operation of the phone. The Office Action cites Yoshikawa's col. 7, lines 47-51 and col. 8, lines 3-8 for these features. However, this cited section merely relates to operating a switch. This does not relate to selecting a mode of operation of the phone. Accordingly, Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 17. Thus, independent claim 17 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 18 recites a first phone unit which operates in an ISDN mode, a second phone unit which operates in an IP mode, and a control unit which establishes a voice path between the first phone unit and the second phone unit based on a user mode selection signal, the user mode selection signal selecting one of an ISDN mode, an IP mode or an external connection of the phone.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Yoshikawa and the other applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 17. Furthermore, Yoshikawa does not suggest a signal to select one of an ISDN mode, an IP mode or an external connection of the phone. Accordingly, Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest a control unit which establishes a voice path between the first unit and the second unit based on a user mode selection signal. Accordingly, independent claim 18 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 14, 17 and 18 define patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the

independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 22 (and similarly dependent claims 24 and 25) recites that the ISDN phone unit accesses an ISDN simultaneously as the IP phone unit accesses the Internet or a computer. Yoshikawa and the other applied references do not teach or suggest these features as Yoshikawa clearly relates to a single ISDN line 3. Thus, Yoshikawa and the other applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of dependent claim 22 (and similarly dependent claims 24 and 25). Thus, these dependent claims define patentable subject matter for at least this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 and 20-25 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **10/621,468**

Docket No. **K-0531**

Reply to Office Action dated March 22, 2006

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and
please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: June 20, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610